DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 443 80 EA 008 828

AUTHOR	Folger, John K.; And Others
TITLE	The Imperative of Leadership VI. A Report on the Planning, Improvement and Governance of Vocational and Vocational Technical Education.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Boards of Education, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of State Agency Cooperation.; New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	Feb 76
NOTE	17p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of State Boards of Education, 810 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Role; Board of Education Role; Elementary Secondary Education; Governance; *Guidelines; Post Secondary Education; Program Coordination; *State Agencies; *State Boards of Education; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title V; ESEA Title V; State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This booklet is one of a series of reports addressing the most critical issues confronting state boards of education throughout the United States. Each report attempts to present a concise, informative review and analysis of the best and most current information available on one of these critical topics. This booklet focuses on statewide planning and governance of vocational education, and particularly on the role of state boards of education and state advisory councils on vocational education. Section 1 presents a brief overview and summary of the booklet. Section 2 contains three related articles, including "The Role and Responsibilities of State Boards of Education in State Planning and Coordination of Postsecondary Vocational Education," by John K. Folger and Alms C. McGuinness, Jr.; "The Role of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education and Their Relationships to State Boards of Education," by Reginald Petty; and "Governance of Vocational Education," by Lowell A. Burkett. Section 3 presents a number of action alternatives recommended by the staff of the National Association of State Boards of Education; and section 4 contains footnotes and a brief annotated bibliography prepared by the authors of section 2. (Author/JG)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED130443

THE IMPERATIVE OF LEADERSHIP

VI

A REPORT ON THE PLANNING, IMPROVEMENT AND GOVERNANCE OF VOCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION

EA 008 828

NASBE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE 3

SECTION I — Overview Summary 4

SECTION II — Planning, Improvement and Governance of Vocational and Vocational Technical Education ... 7

The Role and Responsibilities of State Boards of Education in State Planning and Coordination of Post-Secondary Vocational Education 7

The Role of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education and their Relationships to State Boards of Education 9

Governance of Vocational Education 11

SECTION III — Action Alternatives 13

SECTION IV — Appendix 15

PREFACE

This report on *The Planning, Improvement and Governance of Vocational and Vocational Technical Education* represents the sixth in a series of twelve papers on critical issues affecting State Boards of Education. Publication of these reports is made available to all NASBE members by funds provided by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, Title V, Section 505) provided through the state of New York.

This report is organized into four sections. Section I contains an *Overview Summary* on the research text. Section II is the complete research text which presents the views of three authors on the subject of *The Planning, Improvement, and Governance of Vocational and Vocational Technical Education.* "The Role and Responsibilities of State Boards of Education in State Planning and Coordination of Postsecondary Vocational Education" was written by Dr. John K. Folger and Aims C. McGuinness, Jr., director and assistant director, respectively, of the Evaluation and Improvement of Statewide Planning in Postsecondary Education Projects, Education Commission of the States. The second article "The Role of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education and their Relationships to State Boards of Education" was authored by Reginald Petty, executive director, National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. The subject of "Governance of Vocational Education" was addressed by Lowell A. Burkett, executive director, American Vocational Association. Section III contains *Action Alternatives* developed by the NASBE staff. Section IV is the *Appendix* containing Footnotes and an Annotated Bibliography.

This organizational format was chosen to meet the needs of several types of readers. The *Overview Summary* is intended for the reader who is concerned with the subject but for various reasons does not wish to be burdened with detail. Sections II through IV (containing research text, pragmatic alternatives and review sources) are provided for the technical reader who wishes an indepth study of the topic.

NASBE wishes to express appreciation to the Center for Research and Education (CRE) in Denver who coordinated the research efforts and to the authors of the research text on *The Planning, Improvement and Governance of Vocational and Vocational Technical Education.*

James M. Connor
NASBE, President

February 1976
Denver, Colorado

SECTION I — OVERVIEW SUMMARY

The nature and importance of vocational education have changed dramatically in the past 15 years. With these changes have come pressures for examining and reconsidering the existing approaches to statewide planning and coordination. In summary, the issues that have changed, and will continue to change, the role and responsibilities of those involved in vocational education relate to:

- the increasing proportion of jobs in a technological and service economy that require vocational education and training beyond the secondary level, but at a less-than-baccalaureate level;
- the broadening of the definition of vocational education beyond skill development in a few specific areas to a program to prepare persons for all ages, with widely differing aptitudes and career goals, for immediate employment, future careers, or continued productive employment through re-training or continuing education;
- increasing public skepticism about the relationship of traditional education to the world of work; and
- increasing competition for tax resources in a time of inflation and growing public concern for efficiency and accountability in the expenditure of public funds.

The Federal Government, ever since the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, has required each state (receiving financial assistance) to designate a state board for the planning and administration of vocational education. Some states created new boards for this purpose; most designated existing boards — usually the State Board of Education. Although the concept of a sole state agency is considered by many to be sound, it creates a problem in governance due to the wide coverage of vocational education.

In the past, with most vocational-technical programs at the secondary level, there was a relatively uncomplicated working relationship between the federal and state boards and other state agencies. A State Board of Education could operate fairly autonomously in establishing policies and priorities for vocational education. Today, however, because of the kinds of issues summarized above and the resulting federal legislation, few if any of the State Boards with responsibility for vocational education can act without a major concern for interagency planning and coordination.

A basic question, then, to be answered by State Boards of Education is this:

How can the State Board provide leadership, planning, policy development, equitable distribution of federal and state funds, and ongoing evaluation of vocational education at all educational levels, in a period of rapid change, when the responsibility for vocational education programs is divided among, or shared by, several state agencies?

Dr. John Folger and Aims McGuinness of the Educational Commission of the States focus on this question as it relates to postsecondary vocational education.

Six states have a separate State Board for Vocational Education, but responsibility for postsecondary vocational education is shared with a higher education governing or coordinating board. In all other states, where the State Board of Education is also the State Board for Vocational Education, there are varying degrees of involvement of other groups in the planning and operation of post-secondary vocational education (state universities with constitutional autonomy, local boards governing community colleges and/or technical schools, separate boards for some or all of postsecondary education, statutory state agencies for coordination of all public higher education, etc.). Thus in most states there is a dual responsibility for postsecondary vocational education. Even those states with a single board responsible for *all* levels of education have internal problems of planning and coordination among several divisions within the state education agency.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 required the states to set aside a minimum of 15 percent of their federal allotments for postsecondary education; the Amendments of 1968 required the formation of state advisory councils for vocational education to provide a systematic means for lay-citizenry input in planning and evaluation. The effectiveness of such arrangements, however, continues to vary significantly from state to state.

In the 1972 Amendments to the Higher Education Act, the Federal Government again emphasized the importance of state planning and coordination in education through a requirement that states establish postsecondary education planning commissions (known as 1202 Commissions). They were to be representative of the general public and of public, private nonprofit, and proprietary postsecondary institutions — including vocational-technical institutes and area vocational schools. But questions are being raised about the extent to which vocational education is represented.

For some, these two federal laws appear to be in conflict. Actually, they merely reflect the diversity and complexity of our educational system. If vocational education is to be an integral part of education as it occurs at all levels, then planning and policy development for vocational education should be an integral part of planning for each level. The difficulty lies, of course, in achieving integration and coordination of leadership, planning and policy development among all the agencies concerned.

Some have suggested that the solution lies in centralization of control of vocational education programs under a single board. But this solution tends to ignore two fundamental points: (1) In most states the elementary, secondary and postsecondary education systems are highly decentralized for purposes of administration. Centralization of control of vocational education

could lead to an undesirable isolation from other education programs. (2) An emphasis on centralization of control tends to blur the important distinction between policy development, planning and priority setting on the one hand and implementation, supervision and administration of programs on the other hand.

Maintenance of a diverse educational system requires decentralization of day-to-day control of programs; but that decentralization should occur within the framework of comprehensive statewide leadership, planning and policy development. It is in the latter area that the State Board of Education has its primary responsibility.

The focus should be not on questions of who's running the show and whose "turf" is being invaded, but on questions of state priorities, integrated planning, and evaluation. The concern should be for ways to achieve coordination of shared responsibility, rather than on ways to centralize control of program operation. It is incumbent on the State Board of Education, in most cases, to assume this responsibility by taking on the job of coordination of shared responsibility among the state-level agencies or boards for postsecondary and vocational education. Only in this way will the changing needs for vocational education be met with the efficiency and effectiveness that the public is likely to demand from our educational system in the next decade.

Reginald Petty, Executive Director of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, focuses on the question by discussing the role of the State Advisory Council — i.e., to provide information to the State Board of (Vocational) Education in the form of recommendations (advice) for the planning, improvement, and evaluation of the state's vocational education program. Established under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the role of the State Advisory Council was strengthened under the Education Amendments of 1972 by definition of the following responsibilities:

- Advising the Board on the development of the state plan for vocational education and on policy matters arising in the administration of the plan.
- Holding public meetings and hearings at which the general public is given opportunity to express its views.
- Evaluating at the state and local levels the effectiveness and accomplishments of vocational education programs in terms of the goals and objectives contained in the state plan.
- Recommending such changes in programs, services and activities as may be warranted by the evaluations; and publishing an annual report of its findings and recommendations.
- Encouraging the Board and any other involved state agencies to accept and implement as much as possible the Council's recommendations, and advocating needed changes in legislation, funding, etc.

The only mandated relationship is one of giving and receiving advice — that the State Board will involve the Council in the development of the state plan, that the Council will provide recommendations based on lay-citizen input, and that the State Board will respond to those recommendations. The State Advisory Council provides the knowledgeable opinion of all those within the community who are concerned with the process of vocational education (e.g., educators, business and industry, labor, groups with specific educational concerns). The value of this advice is in the autonomy of the Council. Because it is independent of the state department of (vocational) education, it can provide an unbiased evaluation of the effectiveness of the state's programs and recommendations for change not limited by institutional constraints.

Some of the areas in which the Council can assist the State Board include:

- Development of the state plan.
- Needs assessment, based on public hearings and survey questionnaires, pertaining to career education, occupational guidance, job placement measures, programs for the handicapped, etc.
- Aid in seeking additional state legislative funding.
- Articulation of secondary school programs with postsecondary programs, and coordination of vocational education programs with other community and area manpower development programs.

This linkage between an independent advisory body and a responsive state agency will enable vocational education to grow — eliminating weaknesses and building up strengths.

Lowell Burkett, Executive Director of the American Vocational Association, focuses on the question by providing guidelines for the "ideal" composition of a sole state agency for vocational education.

Based on these three major factors —

- that the concept of the single state agency is sound,
- that the national program of vocational education will continue to serve an increasingly large number of persons of all ages, and
- that vocational education will continue as an education and training program cutting across a variety of educational entities whose involvement is essential for a planned, articulated, and administered program to serve the needs of all people —

the American Vocational Association recommends that:

- All persons appointed to the State Board for Vocational Education should possess a working knowledge of vocational education or a concern for the mission of vocational education.
- Actual experience range of Board members should be representative of high schools, postsecondary institutions that administer a vocational education component,

management, labor, business and industry, agriculture, and the public at large.

- The Board should be composed of persons appointed t serve staggered terms of not less than three years. It should select its own chairman and assure the appointment of a person to serve as the State Director of Vocational Education to carry out Board policies.
- The Board should have responsibility for administering, planning, and coordinating a total program of vocational education which takes into consideration manpower training programs other than those conducted by public educational institutions.

SECTION II — THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION IN STATE PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Dr. John K. Folger, Director,
Aims C. McGuinness, Jr., Assistant Director,
Evaluation and Improvement of Statewide Planning in Postsecondary Education Project,
Education Commission of the States

The nature of vocational education and its importance, not only within education but to the general public, have changed dramatically in the past fifteen years. With these changes have come pressures for reconsideration of existing approaches to statewide planning and coordination in vocational education. One area of particular concern is the relation of postsecondary vocational education not only to vocational education at other levels but also to other areas of postsecondary education.

The federal Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 required each state receiving assistance under the Act to designate a state board for vocational education. With most vocational education programs at that time being at a secondary level, it was logical that all but a few states designated the existing state boards of education or public instruction as the required "sole state agency" for the purposes of this federal Act. Today, the State Board of Education is the state board for vocational education in all but six states.

In the past fifteen years, and especially since 1970, a number of issues have arisen that have changed, and will continue to change, the role and responsibilities of the State Boards of Education in vocational education. In summary, these relate to:

- the increasing proportion of jobs in a technological and service economy that require vocational education and training beyond the secondary level, but at a less-than-baccalaureate level;
- the broadening of the definition of vocational education beyond an emphasis on skill development in a few specific areas to a program to prepare persons of all ages, with widely differing aptitudes and career goals, for immediate employment, future careers, or continued productive employment through retraining or continuing education;
- increasing public skepticism about the relationship of traditional education to the world of work, and the effectiveness of this education in terms of preparation for employment or careers; and
- increasing competition not only among various educational sectors but also among various social programs for tax resources in a time of inflation and growing public concern for efficiency and accountability in the expenditure of public funds.

In the past, when most vocational programs were at the secondary level, a State Board of Education with primary responsibilities at that level could establish policies and priorities for vocational education without major concern for coordination with other state education agencies. Today, however, because of the kinds of issues summarized above, few if any of the state boards with responsibility for vocational education can act without a major concern for interagency planning and coordination.

These responsibilities must be carried out not only in cooperation with other agencies (especially with those boards or commissions with legal responsibility for statewide planning, coordination or governance of higher or postsecondary education) but also in a rapidly changing environment where the public and members of the legislature are increasingly concerned about the cost and effectiveness of educational programs. In the past, vocational education has not been criticized as much as other parts of education; but there are clear signs that this situation is changing. Vocational education will have to demonstrate that it has not been guilty of overexpansion, is cost conscious, and is able to prepare its graduates for productive work.[1]

A basic question, then, to be answered by State Boards of Education is this:

> How can the State Board provide leadership, planning, policy development, equitable distribution of federal and state funds, and ongoing evaluation for vocational education at all educational levels, in a period of rapid change, when the responsibility for vocational education programs is divided among, or shared by, several state agencies?

This brief review focuses on this question as it relates to postsecondary vocational education.

In all states, there are several different agencies that have some responsibility for planning, coordinating, or operating postsecondary vocational education. In six states (Colorado, Indiana, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Washington and Wisconsin) there is a separate State Board for Vocational Education and responsibility for postsecondary vocational education is divided between that board and a higher education governing or coordinating board. In the 44 states and the District of Columbia, where the State Board of Education is also the State Board for Vocational Education, there are varying degrees of involvement of other groups in the planning and operation of postsecondary vocational education.

In six states (Florida, Pennsylvania, Idaho, New York, Michigan and Rhode Island) there is a single state board responsible for *all* levels of education. Statewide planning of postsecondary vocational education here is generally a program of inter-agency coordination, i.e., in each of these states different divisions within the jurisdiction of the single board are responsible for

higher education on the one hand and vocational education on the other hand. (However, even in these states there may be other involvement. In Michigan, for example, the State Board of Education has coordinating authority over all education, but the three major universities, which offer some vocational programs of less than baccalaureate level, have constitutional autonomy.) In one state (Oregon) an education coordinating commission serves as the statewide planning agency for all education, including programs under both the State Board of Education and the state higher education boards.

In all other states, responsibility for postsecondary vocational education is shared or divided among two or three state-level boards. In 32 states and the District of Columbia, there is a State Board of Education and a separate constitutional or statutory statewide coordinating or governing agency for higher education. (In a number of these states there are also state boards for community colleges or technical institutes, but these are within the planning and coordinating jurisdiction of either the State Board of Education or the state higher education board.)

In two other states (Arizona and South Carolina) there are three state-level boards with responsibility for postsecondary vocational education: a State Board of Education, a state coordinating or governing board for higher education, and a state board for community colleges or technical institutes which functions independently of either of the other two boards.

Finally, in three states (Delaware, Nebraska, and Vermont), responsibility is divided between the State Board of Education and two or more postsecondary institutional governing boards. Although there is no statutory agency for statewide planning and coordination of higher education, there is a state postsecondary education commission established by governor's executive order which provides for statewide planning and coordination among these boards.

In the Vocational Educational Act of 1973, states were required to set aside a minimum of 15 percent of their federal allotments for postsecondary education. In the 1968 Amendments, requirements for state planning were greatly strengthened and states were required to form state advisory councils for vocational education to provide a systematic means for a broad range of citizen input in planning and evaluation. Despite these changes, however, the effectiveness of arrangements for planning and coordination in vocational education (between elementary/secondary and postsecondary education, and within postsecondary vocational education) continue to vary significantly from state to state.

In a number of states, dual systems of community colleges with vocational programs and postsecondary vocational-technical schools have developed, often serving the same regions and the same student clientele with similar programs but without inter-institutional coordination. In other states, community colleges, especially those not under the jurisdiciton of the State Board for Vocational Education, have claimed they have not been allocated their share of federal vocational education funds.

In 1973, the states allocated on the average 24 percent of their federal vocational education funds for postsecondary education, but the percentages for individual states varied from a low of 12 percent (below the federally-mandated minimum) to a high of 61 percent. Questions have been raised in some states about the apparent over-emphasis on allocations to postsecondary education to the neglect of needs at the elementary and secondary levels.

Interestingly, the variations in state structure related to postsecondary vocational education do not relate in any identifiable way to the percentage of federal vocational education funds allocated to postsecondary education. The percentage figures on use of federal funds do not, of course, reflect how the states allocated their own resources for postsecondary vocational education. Nevertheless, it is not possible to identify any one structural arrangement as opposed to others which has led certain states to allocate a greater proportion of federal funds for postsecondary education.

In the Education Amendments of 1972, the Federal Government again emphasized the importance of state planning and coordination in education through a requirement that states desiring to receive federal assistance establish state postsecondary education planning commissions (called 1202 Commissions because of the section of the law in which the provision appears). These commissions were to be representative of the general public and of public, private nonprofit, and proprietary postsecondary institutions in the state — including public vocational-technical institutes and area vocational schools. The functions of these commissions were to be comprehensive planning for all postsecondary education in the state, and state planning for community colleges and occupational education. Funding has been provided only for the comprehensive planning function, although this is to encompass planning related to community colleges and occupational education.

Forty-six states and the District of Columbia established 1202 Commissions by 1974. In the six states in which all education, including vocational education, is the responsibility of a single state board, that board serves as the 1202 commission. (In one state the board was augmented for this purpose; in the others advisory committees are used to achieve the breadth of representation intended in the federal law). In 12 states and the District of Columbia, new commissions were established all of which include some representation from vocational education. In the remaining 28 states, existing postsecondary education agencies were designated. The membership of a number of the existing agencies was augmented to meet the representation requirements. The majority of these commissions have one or more members who are directly responsible for or are involved in vocational education in the state. Nevertheless, questions have been raised in several states about the extent to which vocational education is represented on the 1202 Commissions.

For some, these two federal laws — the Vocational Education Act and Section 1202 of the Higher Education Act — appear to be in conflict. In fact, however, they reflect the diversity and

complexity of our educational system. If vocational education is to be an integral part of education as it occurs at all levels, then planning and policy development for vocational education should be an integral part of planning for each level. The difficulty, of course, lies in achieving an integration and coordination of vocational education leadership, planning and policy development among several state agencies.

Some have suggested that the solution lies in centralization of control of vocational education programs under a single board. But this solution tends to ignore two fundamental points: First, in most states both the elementary/secondary and postsecondary education systems are highly decentralized for the purpose of governance or administration. Centralization of control of vocational education could lead to reinforcement of an artificial and undesirable isolation of vocational education from other education programs. Secondly, an emphasis on centralization of control tends to blur the important distinction between policy development, planning, and priority setting on the one hand, and implementation, supervision, governance and administration of programs on the other hand.

Maintenance of a diverse educational system, especially in postsecondary vocational education, requires decentralization of governance, administration and day-to-day control of programs. But that decentralization should occur within the context or framework of comprehensive statewide leadership, planning and policy development. It is in the latter area that the State Board of Education has its primary responsibility.

The goal sought by all those in positions of educational leadership at the state level should be to achieve effective and efficient use of all the state's resources — elementary, secondary, and postsecondary; formal and informal' public, private nonprofit, and proprietary — to meet the vocational education and manpower training needs of the people of the state. The State Board of Education should strive for this goal, focusing not on questions of who's running the program and whose "turf" is being invaded, but on questions of state priorities and policies, integrated planning, and evaluation. In those states in which the State Board of Education shares responsibility for state educational policy development and planning with other boards (postsecondary education boards or vocational education boards), it should seek means to achieve joint and cooperative development of policies and plans, especially on matters such as vocational education that concerns both boards. The concern should be for ways to achieve coordination of shared responsibility, rather than on ways to centralize control of program operation.

The key to effective planning and coordination lies with the states. The Federal Government has emphasized the necessity for planning and coordination, and has provided funds to make it possible, but it is the states that have to implement these efforts. Specifically, it is incumbent on each state to see that its postsecondary planning activities and its vocational planning activities are not operating at cross purposes to one another, and that the sum of the various efforts in the state will provide effective and efficient programs.

If the State Board of Education assumes this responsibility, and where appropriate takes the leadership in developing arrangements for coordination of shared responsibility with state-level agencies or boards for postsecondary education, the changing needs of the state's people for vocational education can be met with the efficiency and effectiveness that the public is likely to demand from our educational system in the next decade.

THE ROLE OF THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Reginald Petty, Executive Director,
National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

Since 1963, it has been the intent of the U. S. Congress that State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (SACVE) provide the mechanism for lay-citizenry input into the planning and improvement of statewide vocational education. State Advisory Councils were established through the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and legally mandated for all states and U. S. territories receiving federal vocational education funds through the Amendments of 1968.

In order to assure a broad representation of the public among the membership of the State Councils, the law requires that those appointed include:

- individuals familiar with the manpower needs of business and labor,
- representatives of community and junior colleges, area vocational schools and technical institutes,
- representatives of local education agencies, manpower and vocational education agencies,
- individuals from school districts with large concentrations of disadvantaged students,
- persons having special qualifications with respect to the handicapped, and
- representatives of the general public.

The membership of these Councils are appointed by the governor in forty-two states and by the State Boards of Education (elected) in the remaining fourteen.

The role of the State Advisory Councils is to provide information to the State Board of Education (or State Board of Vocational Education) in the form of recommendations (advice) for the planning, improvement, and evaluation of the state's vocational education program. The

Education Amendments of 1972 strengthened the role of the SACVEs by defining the following responsibilities:

- Advising the Board on the development of the state plan for vocational education. This includes the involvement of the SACVE in the preparation of both the annual and the long-range state plan, which is required prior to the receipt of federal funds.
- Advising the State Board on policy matters arising in the administration of the state plan. Many SACVEs are concerned with the types of programs offered throughout the state, the placement of students in jobs upon completion of these programs, and the applicability of the training offered to the employability of the individual.
- Holding public meetings and hearings at which the general public is given opportunity to express its views. The responsibility of providing representation of the community's concerns is taken seriously by most SACVEs. Public meetings and/or hearings provide the opportunity for Council members to keep abreast of issues and problems, as well as the successes, of vocational education in meeting the needs of the individuals being served by the system.
- Evaluating at the state and local level the effectiveness and accomplishments of vocational education programs in terms of the goals and objectives contained in the state plan for attracting its potential clientele and serving their needs. This responsibility is carried out in a variety of ways: Some conduct comprehensive evaluations of the state's program; others focus on a specific issue each year or several issues within a given year.
- Recommending such changes in programs, services and activities as may be warranted by the evaluations. These recommendations are included as part of the SACVE's annual report to the U. S. Office of Education, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, and the State Board of (Vocational) Education. The State Board of Education should provide response to the SACVE indicating its acceptance, rejection, or modification of such recommendations.

Publishing any special reports as may be warranted, including the required annual report of its evaluation findings and recommendations for change.

- Encouraging the State Board and any other involved state agencies to accept and implement as much as possible the Council's recommendations. SACVE representatives often attend State Board meetings, or meetings are arranged for an exchange of information and concerns.
- Advocating — either independently or jointly with the State Board, the State Commission, and any other involved State agencies and organizations — needed changes in legislation, funding, etc., affecting vocational education before relevant State officials, the State legislature, the Governor, etc.[2]

The only mandated relationship is one of giving and receiving advice — that the State Board will involve the State Advisory Council in the development of the state plan; that the Council will provide recommendations based upon lay-citizen input to the State Board; and that the State Board will respond to those recommendations.

Many State Boards are becoming aware that the State Advisory Council provides the knowledgeable opinion of all those within the community who are concerned with the process of vocational education — the advice of the general public, business and industry, labor, educators, the disadvantaged, handicapped and other groups with specific educational concerns. The value of this advice is in the autonomy of the State Advisory Council. As it is independent of the state department of (vocational) education, it can provide an unbiased evaluation of the effectiveness of the state's vocational education programs and recommendations for change not limited by institutional constraints.

Concurrently with the establishment of the State Advisory Councils to address the needs of the states, the Congress established a National Advisory Council on Vocational Education to advise the U. S. Commissioner of Education regarding the administration of vocational education on the national level. The twenty-one members of the National Advisory Council are appointed by the President of the United States to be representative of labor and management, manpower programs, and state or local vocational education administration, as well as educators experienced in dealing with the handicapped, persons familiar with postsecondary and adult vocational education programs, and representatives of the general public.

The only legally mandated relationship between the State and National Councils is the transmittal and receipt of the annual evaluation report, but the Councils often focus on similar issues and exchange information. Each year the National Council compiles information from the State Council annual reports and presents a summary of substantive issues to Congress.

Some of the concerns expressed by the State Advisory Councils through their annual reports include:

- **State Plans.** In the NACVE report of 1974, the SACVE generally commended the state departments of (vocational) education for having, in most instances, exceeded the goals and objectives of the state plans in terms of increased enrollments and number of programs in operation, while raising several qualitative questions.
- **Cooperation with State Departments of Education.** Many of the findings and conclusions were based on public hearings and survey questionnaires of parents, students, former students and employers. As a result, the SACVEs felt that sufficient data had been collected and requested information regarding plans to meet the data-identified needs. Many Councils joined with and supported their State Boards and state departments of education in seeking additional state legislative funding for vocational education.

- **Career Education.** SACVEs have pointed out the slow rate of progress being made in implementing career education in the elementary and secondary schools. They made recommendations to the State Boards supporting the concept of career education and urging such specifics as guidance counselor certification, professional development of school administrators and teachers.
- **Articulation.** Articulation of secondary school programs with postsecondary vocational and technical programs — is another problem which a number of Councils have found to be difficult of solution. While the problem is clear, and recommendations for resolving it are simply stated, implementation faces many barriers — particularly that of institutional autonomy, even in state-supported institutions of higher education.
- **Coordination with other Manpower Development Programs.** Coordination of vocational education programs with other community and area manpower development programs and activities remains a continuing problem, but the Councils report significant progress being made. This is an area where the Councils are working closely with their state departments of education and achieving good results.[3]

This list is not a comprehensive picture of the issues facing vocational education, but rather is an indication of the types of issues many SACVEs can bring to the attention of the State Boards. They are issues which many SACVEs have examined closely and have been able to provide significant advice regarding their improvement.

Ideally, State Advisory Councils work closely with their respective State Boards of Education in a cooperative effort aimed at focusing on the improvement of the statewide quality of vocational education. In their annual reports, the SACVEs not only make recommendations to the State Boards based upon current needs, but also assess the degree to which previous recommendations have been implemented.

The process has been productive. The majority of SACVE annual reports indicate the State Boards have been highly responsive to the independent evaluations of the Councils. And most Councils are satisfied with the impact of their recommendations on efforts for implementation evidenced by the action of the State Boards.

The process has been progressive. This positive approach is evidenced through the growth of innovative and responsive programs. Job placement has become an integral part of many vocational schools across the country. Occupational guidance is stressed from the university training level to the administration of vocational and non-vocational schools. More and more programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged are being implemented. By creating this linkage between an independent and advisory body to a responsive state agency, vocational education has been able to grow, eliminating weaknesses and building upon strengths.

GOVERNANCE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Lowell A. Burkett, Executive Director,
American Vocational Association

The federal Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 provided that "... any State shall ... designate or create a State board ... having all the necessary power to cooperate ... with the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the administration of the provisions of this Act. The State board of education, or other board having charge of the administration of public education in the State, or any State board having charge of the administration of any kind of vocational education in the State, may, if the State so elect, be designated as the State board for the purposes of this Act."

For several years prior to the passage of this Act, nationwide discussion had been focused on the relationship of the Federal Board for Vocational Education with the states. Although there were many options, with advocates for each, the consensus developed that the Federal Government should deal with only one board in each state and that the state should have the right to designate what that board would be.

However, "the Federal Board voted that 'The official title of a state board under the Smith-Hughes Act shall, so far as the Federal Board is concerned, be designated as the State Board for Vocational Education.' This action was needed in order to avoid the confusion and misunderstandings which would have arisen had each of the state boards been designated by a title originating in the state. ... Another reason for adopting a uniform nomenclature was in the interest of clarifying the responsibilities of boards which were already created to administer some other phase of the states' educational programs. The boards thus designated are dual boards in that they meet and act on matters affecting their original functions and adjourn only to reconvene immediately as the State Board for Vocational Education and take action affecting the vocational program."[4]

Despite certain problems inherent in any new venture, the various state boards and the federal board learned how to work effectively with each other; and any issue about the nature of the state board seemed to be settled.

Federal legislation since 1917 has not changed the concept of a single state agency in every state with which the Federal Government deals in connection with vocational education. But new problems have appeared on the horizon during the past two decades.

From 1917 to 1963 vocational education was essentially a high school program and a program for adults. The scientific revolution of the 50's and the new social conscience of the

60's, however, caused new attention to be focused upon vocational education. The practice of relating vocational education to occupations caused a number of new laws which had conflicting funding arrangements. It was also apparent that vocational education had to expand to serve more people.

President Kennedy authorized a Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education to study the problem, and their report was used by the Congress as a basis for the Vocational Education Act of 1963. This Act focused attention on four groups of people: (1) High school youth and out-of-school youth of high school age, (2) high school youth and out-of-school youth with special problems, (3) post-high school persons in programs usually not more than two years in length, and (4) out-of-school youth and adults who were preparing to enter the labor market, reenter it, or retrain for a new occupation. The Amendments of 1968 added provisions addressing the problems of the disadvantaged, handicapped, ethnic groups, and women.

Designating a single state agency for vocational education creates a problem in governance in many states due to this wide coverage. The vocational education program exists in high schools, community colleges, area technical schools, regional vocational schools, in some divisions of four-year colleges, and in other similar educational entities each of which has its own administrative structure. Thus there are several agencies in most states that have a claim on the responsibility for delivery of the program. Yet the single state agency that the Federal Government deals with is, in most cases, the State Board of Education which has direct responsibility for only the K-12 educational program. This situation creates claims and counterclaims concerning a justified portion of federal funds available for vocational education.

In addition, in many instances duplicate administrative structures exist at the state level each attempting to serve the needs of local educational agencies in the promotion, development, evaluation, and planning for vocational education. The problem becomes exceedingly complex when vocational education moves to serve disadvantaged, handicapped, and ethnic groups more effectively. Overlapping responsibilities of educational agencies with other state agencies, and with federal manpower programs, causes each to compete with the others in an attempt to serve the groups concerned.

In many respects, the state program problems in vocational education have their origin in the complexities existing at the federal level in relation to a variety of laws concerning vocational education. On the one hand, the Federal Government is justified in holding to the single state agency concept and requiring the state to solve the problem in its own way. It is in no way, then, interfering in the problems of state administration of vocational education. On the other hand, the Congress is specifying rather specifically what it expects vocational education to do in the way of service to people who are being prepared to enter, or to make more effective progress in, the world of work. It is an educational problem which if left entirely up to the state to solve could result in governance decisions that would leave out, or overemphasize, the needs of one group of persons in relation to other groups.

Vocational education cuts across the board in terms of educational levels. It is concerned with persons in junior and senior high schools, junior and community colleges, adult schools, area schools of various kinds, county and regional districts in the various states, and in general with any postsecondary program serving people who are preparing for occupations for which the preparation does not require a baccalaureate degree or occupations that are not generally classified as professional occupations.

Toward a Solution

The American Vocational Association believes that:

- The concept of a single state agency is sound, from the standpoint of the number of different kinds of educational institutions within the state that the Federal Government would have to work with. The alternative would be an order of complex confusion too difficult to comprehend.
- Due to the influence of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Amendments of 1968, and the proposed legislation of 1975-76, the national program of vocational education (now serving roughly 14,000,000 people) will serve an increasingly larger number of persons of all ages in the future.
- Vocational education will continue as an education and training program cutting across a variety of educational entities, served by different kinds of administrations within a state, and their involvement is essential for a planned, articulated, and administered program to serve the needs of all people.

Thus, the American Vocational Association recommends that:

- All persons appointed to the State Board for Vocational Education should possess a working knowledge of vocational education or a concern for the mission of vocational education.
- Actual experience range of Board members should be representative of high schools, postsecondary institutions (exclusive of 4-year institutions except those that administer a vocational education component), management, labor, business and industry, agriculture, and the public at large.
- The Board should be composed of persons appointed to serve staggered terms of not less than three years. It should select its own chairman and assure the appointment of a person to serve as the State Director of Vocational Education to carry out Board policies in accord with federal law and the state plan for vocational education.
- The Board should have responsibility for administering, planning and coordinating a total program of vocational education which takes into consideration manpower training programs other than those conducted by public educational institutions.

SECTION III — ACTION ALTERNATIVES

NASBE STAFF SUGGESTIONS TO STATE BOARDS

RESTATING THE PROBLEM

When created by the Smith Hughes Act in 1917, the concept of a sole state agency for vocational education governance was quite sound. During the past 15 years, however, there have been dramatic changes in the field of vocational education. In the 60's vocational education expanded beyond the walls of the secondary schools into postsecondary vocational-technical schools, community and/or junior colleges, private proprietory schools and even into some four year baccalaureate institutions. Federal manpower programs, vocational rehabilitation programs and other vocationally oriented programs were also started by various agencies to serve the disadvantaged, the handicapped and minority groups. As vocational costs expanded and as vocational programs were duplicated by varying institutions and agencies, state legislatures and Congress began to question the appropriateness of the costs. As student interest turned away from four year programs to vocationally oriented programs and as college enrollments dropped, junior college, community college and four year college administrators, sometimes at the direction of the legislature, expanded vocational offerings. With shrinking state dollars, sharp competition developed over the allocation of federal dollars.

As America's manpower needs changed, large numbers of adults returned for vocational education skills. Their skill training needs were not necessarily correlated with existing institutional course offerings or with the K-12 and post-secondary fund distribution and attendance accounting mechanisms. To ensure appropriate state level solutions and after much territorial turfdom battles, some states arrived at workable solutions. Almost simultaneously and sometimes at variance with state solutions, the federal government enacted amendments mandating vocational advisory councils, 1202 planning commissions and other highly specific elements. The federal government took these actions to ensure that their perception of national manpower needs were met, that increased federal vocational dollars were wisely spent, and in response to the lobbying pressure of labor, agriculture, business, minorities, vocational directors and higher education.

In addition to the above scenario, the following interact to compound the problem:

1. a philosophical difference between postsecondary college oriented vocational programs and the more direct labor/agriculture/business orientation of vocational technical schools;
2. the gap between emerging manpower needs and traditional vocational education course offerings;
3. some archaic state level vocational fund distribution formulas which distribute funds by out dated occupational titles;
4. some state level advisory councils which misconstrue their role and some state boards which ignore state advisory council recommendations without rationale;
5. institutional resistance to change;
6. the multiplicity of competing program delivery agencies, administrative bodies and policy boards involved in the various aspects of vocational education;
7. the personal agendas of labor unions that view vocational programs as one method of controlling the number of trained persons available for a trade; of certain businesses which require a narrow skill range; of some vocational educators who have built up comfortable fiefdoms; and of minority groups who seek entrance into the more highly paid skill area.

Toward Solutions

From this paper it should be clear that the vocational governance structures within the various states are so diverse that single solutions would be inordinately naive. What follows are a variety of *suggestions* which may or may not be technically or politically feasible in your state but which nevertheless, should provide a fruitful basis for discussion. (These *suggestions* do not necessarily reflect the policy positions of NASBE.)

1. In those states which have separate governance boards for K-12 and higher education, or for K-12, junior and/or community colleges, and higher education, designate two persons from each board to act as a combined body to:
   a. sign off on the state plan
   b. distribute federal funds
   c. approve new vocational programs to ensure that needless duplication does not develop.

   All other policy and administrative decisions would remain with the respective state boards regarding vocational education.
2. Maintain the current vocational board, but when the state plan is approved and when federal funds are distributed select from the vocational advisory council representatives from the postsecondary area to provide special testimony on postsecondary needs currently not adequately addressed.
3. Convene a special task force equally representative of the K-12, vocational-technical, junior or community college, manpower programs and higher education; also include representatives from the legislature and from the governors office to develop
   a. an agreed upon system for allocating funds between K-12 and post-secondary institutions;
   b. identification of post-secondary courses which will be allowable for vocational fund reimbursement;

c. a common vocational unit accounting system at the post-secondary level for claiming vocational funds;

d. an analysis of K-12 vocational programs and costs to assess relevance to emerging manpower needs and to establish a range of acceptable course costs as opposed to reimbursement based upon declared costs;

4. Develop an independent program audit group answerable directly to the state board which distributes vocational funds to audit the adequacy and accuracy of all vocational programs receiving federal or state funds, such audits to be completed annually on randomly selected programs from each category of vocational programming;
5. Convene a series of meetings with the vocational advisory council to identify mutual problems, to establish a joint agenda for systematically resolving identified problems and to clarify the role of the council vis-a-vis the state board;
6. Hold a series of joint meetings with existing state boards for post-secondary and higher education to reach joint agreement on vocational fund allocation and a plan for limiting vocational duplication; such meetings might also identify other mutual problems which could be jointly and systematically resolved;
7. Experiment with a vocational voucher plan, such a voucher to be redeemable at the program of student choice if the program has been accredited by the state board; such a plan might require close monitoring by an independent audit group such as that suggested in four (4) above.

In the final analysis the focus should not center on struggles over territorial turfdom rights but rather on questions of state objectives, coordinated planning and harmonious relationships. Central to the entire issue is not the single and absolute control of program operation, but rather the achievement of effective coordination of shared responsibility by state boards of education. At stake is the promise for a responsive and credible system of vocational education that will meet the changing needs and aspirations of our nation's plural publics.

SECTION IV — APPENDIX

FOOTNOTES

[1] See, for example, *Report to Congress: What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education?* (Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, 1974) and Wellford W. Wilms, *Public and Proprietary Vocational Training: A Study of Effectiveness* (Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley, 1974).

[2] *Resource Book for State Advisory Councils* (Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, March 1973), pp. 1-2.

[3] *Unmet Needs and Unresolved Issues of Vocational-Technical Education in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1974), pp. iv-ix.

[4] Layton S. Hawkins, Charles A. Prosser, and John C. Wright, *Development of Vocational Education* (Chicago: American Technical Society, 1951), p. 181.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Christoffel, Pamela H., *Vocational Education. Alternatives for New Federal Legislation.* Washington, D.C.: College Entrance Examination Board, September 1975.
Reviews and analyzes major proposals for amendments to the federal Vocational Education Act, including those of the American Vocational Association, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, American Personnel Guidance Association, and National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges).

Coordination or Chaos? Report of the Task Force on Coordination, Governance Structure of Postsecondary Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1973.
Reviews the status of the coordination and governance structure of postsecondary education in the states and the recommendations of various study groups in that area, and makes policy recommendations for the states on how to improve state coordination and governance.

Report to the Congress: What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education? Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, 1974.
Reports on the operation of federally-assisted vocational education programs within the states.

The Changing Map of Postsecondary Education P State Postsecondary Education Commissions (1202): Their Origin, Development and Current Status. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1975.
Reviews the legislative history, implementation and current status of state commissions established under Section 1202 of the Higher Education Act.

Vocation as Calling. Report of the Task Force on Postsecondary Vocational Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1971.
Reviews the status of occupational education programs at the state level and makes policy recommendations for improvements in state planning and coordination.

Wilms, Welliford W., *Public and Proprietary Vocational Training: A Study of Effectiveness.* Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley, 1974.
Reports on a study of the effectiveness (job placement or preparation for careers) of vocational programs in public community colleges and proprietary vocational schools.

(The bibliography above was prepared by Dr. Folger and Mr. McGuinness of the Education Commission of the States.)

Orientation 75. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, March 1975.
A manual prepared for the orientation of new members of the National Advisory Council, including current data on vocational education appropriations and enrollments, the role of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, NACVE bylaws, structure, staffing, reports, projects, and liaison relationships.

Resource Book for State Advisory Councils. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, March 1973.
A comprehensive explanation of the role of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, including interpretation of responsibilities, examination of formal and informal relationships with various state and local organizations, relationships with federal agencies, and suggestions for council operation.

Summary Report — State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, memorandum of August 28, 1975.
A summary analysis of State Advisory Council membership for FY 1976, including the number of council members, appointment authority, term of appointment, legislative category representation, and female and occupational representation.

Unmet Needs and Unresolved Issues of Vocational-Technical Education in the U.S. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1974.
A summary of the substantive issues and concerns of the compiled annual reports from the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education.

(The above bibliography was prepared by Reginald Petty of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education.)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE
BOARDS OF EDUCATION
810 Lincoln Towers
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203
303/861-0911